

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST
9 LITIGATION

No. M 07-1827 SI
MDL No. 1827

10 This Order Relates To:

No. C 12-1426 SI

11 NECO ALLIANCE LLC,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.
16

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF NECO
ALLIANCE'S MOTION FOR AN ORDER
AUTHORIZING PLAINTIFF TO SERVE
DEFENDANT CHUNGHWA PICTURE
TUBES, LTD. THROUGH ITS U.S.
COUNSEL**

17 Plaintiff has filed a motion to serve a foreign defendant, Chunghwa Picture Tubes Ltd., through
18 its U.S. counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3). The Court has previously heard
19 and granted a number of similar motions in this MDL. *See, e.g.*, Order Re: Defendant Nexgen
20 MediaTech Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss for Insufficient Service of Process; Quashing Service; and
21 Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion to Serve Nexgen Through its Counsel Under Fed. R. Civ.
22 P. 4(f)(3), Master Docket No. 725 (Nov. 19, 2008); *see also* Master Docket Nos. 1309, 1657, 1779,
23 2109, 2532, 2584, 2747, 2748, 2825, 3079, 3217, 3345, 3394, 3443, 3654, 3655, 4785. Chunghwa has
24 opposed these motions to preserve its objections to this manner of service, but has recognized this
25 Court's inclination to permit service through its U.S. counsel.

26 Given the number of these motions, the Court is well acquainted with the content of Chunghwa's
27
28

1 opposition.¹ In order to save Chunghwa the time and expense of filing another opposition brief, the
2 Court rules as follows:

3 For the reasons set forth in its prior orders, the Court finds that service under Rule 4(f)(3) is both
4 available to plaintiff and appropriate in this case. *See, e.g., Rio Properties, Inc. v. Rio Intern. Interlink,*
5 284 F.3d 1007, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding that service of process under Rule 4(f)(3) is not a “last
6 resort,” but “merely one means among several which enables service of process on an international
7 defendant”). Further, due to Chunghwa’s active participation in this MDL for the past three years, the
8 Court finds that service through its U.S. counsel will fully comport with due process. *See FMAC Loan*
9 *Receivables v. Dagra*, 228 F.R.D. 531, 534 (E.D. Va. 2005) (finding service on defendant through his
10 attorney complied with due process because the numerous motions filed by defendant’s attorney made
11 it “abundantly clear” that the two had been in constant communication).


12 Absent further objection from Chunghwa, plaintiff may serve Chunghwa through its U.S.
13 counsel **after June 19, 2012**. If Chunghwa has a specific objection not already addressed by the prior
14 orders of this Court, it may file an opposition before that date.

16 CONCLUSION

17 For the foregoing reasons and for good cause shown, the Court hereby GRANTS plaintiff’s
18 motion to serve Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd. through its U.S. counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of
19 Civil Procedure 4(f)(3). Docket No. 12 in 12-1426; Docket No. 5762 in 07-1827. Absent objection
20 from Chunghwa, plaintiff may serve Chunghwa through counsel after June 19, 2012.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: June 5, 2012



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

26 _____
27 ¹Specifically, Chunghwa’s opposition briefs have argued 1) that plaintiffs have not met the
28 requirements for invoking alternative service under Rule 4(f)(3); and 2) that service through its U.S.
counsel violates due process.